UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/342,408	06/28/1999	PING-WEN ONG	12	6490

7590   01/14/2003

RYAN MASON & LEWIS, LLP
1300 POST ROAD, SUITE 205
FAIRFIELD,, CT   06430

EXAMINER
HUYNH, THU V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/342,408		ONG, PING-WEN	
	Examiner		**Art Unit**	
	Thu V Huynh		2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _31 October 2002_ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-25_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-25_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _8_ .	6)☐ Other: .

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No. 9

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 10/31/2002 of

application filed on 06/28/1999.

2. Claims 1-25 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims.

3. Claims 3, 4, 15 and 16 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. **Claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-25 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Freeman et al., US 6,006,227 as supplied by the Applicants in IDS filed

on 10/09/2001 in view of Bohannon et al., US 6,125,371 filed 08/1997.

Regarding independent claim 1, Freeman teaches the steps of:

- receiving a request for an electronic document, said request including a variable time-

stamp (Freeman, col.3, lines 15-29, receiving a request including chronological

indicator time stamp from a user); and

- identifying said electronic document corresponding to said variable time-stamp

(Freeman, col.4 lines 43-46).

Freeman does not explicitly disclose identifying versions of said electronic document

corresponding to said variable time stamp, but his chronological indicators are in fact timestamp

used to identify the associated electronic documents.

Bohannon teaches the implementation of versioning and the use of time stamp to identify

the different versions of the document (Bohannon, col.5 lines 36-41)

It would have been obvious for a person of skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to combined Freeman and Bohannon to implement the use of time stamps and versioning

to manage a history of documents creation and update since this will provide the capability to

identify the different versions of the documents.

Regarding dependent claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon

teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein an address

identifying said electronic document includes said time-stamp (Freeman, col.3, lines 25-30 and

col.13, lines 20-45).

Regarding dependent claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Freeman and Bohannon

teach the limitations of claim 2 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said address is a

Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") (Freeman, col.13, lines 20-45, web address).

Regarding dependent claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said request is specified using a browser (Freeman, col.13, lines 20-35, web address from a web browser).

Regarding dependent claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said request includes a relative time stamp (Freeman, col.3, lines 19-25, chronological indicators including past, present, and future times).

Regarding dependent claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman does not explicitly disclose wherein said variable time-stamp includes a wildcard character.

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the use of wild cards such in a search request since it was well known that wild cards are useful for indicating unknown component in a search.

Regarding dependent claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said variable time-stamp includes a date range (Freeman, col.7 lines 39-59).

Regarding dependent claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon

teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches displaying a list of the web

resources that satisfy said variable time stamp (Freeman, figure 1 and col.13 lines 10-26).

Regarding dependent claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon

teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said variable time-

stamp can be utilized to identify a version of said electronic document having an unknown time

(Freeman, col.3 lines 19-21 and col.4 lines 62-67).

Regarding dependent claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon

teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches the step of displaying a list

of said documents satisfying said variable time stamp (Freeman, figure 1). However, Freeman

does not disclose the step of displaying a list of said versions satisfying said variable time stamp.

Bohannon teaches the step of maintaining a version list of entry between various versions

of a document.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Bohannon and Freeman to implement the step of

displaying a list of said versions satisfying said variable time stamp since this would have

provided the user with information concerning the different versions of a document.

Regarding dependent claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon

teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches the step of displaying list

of documents in an order specified by a user (Freeman, figure 1). However, Freeman does not

explicitly disclose the step of displaying said list of links in an order specified by a user.

Bohannon teaches the step of maintaining a version list of entry and links between

various versions of a document.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Bohannon and Freeman to implement the step of

displaying said list of links in an order specified by a user since this would have provided the

user with information concerning the links between different versions of a document.

Regarding independent claim 13, claim 13 is for a computer system performing the

method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. Freeman does not explicitly state

that the system have a memory for storing said multiple version of said electronic document in

an archive of electronic documents; and a processor operatively coupled to said memory, said

processor configured to performing method claim 1. However,it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that

Freeman and Bohannon' system must have a memory and a processor to implement the method

as explained in claim 1, since the system is computer system and used on the web.

Claims 14-15 and 17-24 are for a computer system performing the method of claims 2-3

and 5-12, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 25 is for an article of manufacture comprising computer readable medium

performing the method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

6.   **Claims 4 and 16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Freeman in view of Bohannon as applied to claim 3 above and further in view of Kisor et

al., US 5,978,847 filed 12/1996.

Regarding dependent claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Freeman and Bohannon

teach the limitations of claim 3 as explained above. Freeman does not explicitly disclose

wherein said Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") has an associated request header for indicating

said variable time stamp.

Kisor discloses that the URL has an associated request header for indicating said time

stamp (Kisor, col.3, line 50-59, and col.7, line 21-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Kisor and Freeman to allow the client to retrieve desired

Web information based on the time stamp, since Freeman would have provided a time stamp to

determine the Web page's creation time.

Claim 16 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 4, and is rejected

under the same rationale

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed 10/31/2002 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicants argue that Freeman and Bohannon do not show a time-stamp in a user

document request, and that the combination of Freeman and Bohannon teaches away from the

applicants' invention.

This is not persuasive. Freeman disclosure of his find operation using chonological

expression such as "my last letter to Schwart", "my next appointment", etc. (Freeman, col.4 line

64-67) inherently implies there is a timestamp in the user's request for document retrievals.

Another specific feature in Freeman's that shows the user's selection of time-stamps while

requesting for document retrievals is on Fig.1 box 20 and discussed in col.6 line 32-36

(Freeman). Applicants' discussion about specific file name requirements is not to be found in

the claims and thus will not be considered. Nevertheless, Freeman's implementation does

discuss about user's capability to select specific name for his documents if needed. An ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made was certainly able to modified Freeman's

implementation to include other features facilitating the document retrieval processes based on

time-stamps associated in the requests for these documents.

Since Freeman does not explicitly disclose the versioning process, Bohannon's teachings

are used for his versioning and the use of timestamp to identify the different versions of the

document (Bohannon, col.5 lines 36-41). An ordinary skilled in the art would have modified and

combined Bohannon's into Freeman's since they both taught steps of how to use timestamps in

saving, deleting, identifying and retrieving data and documents. In other words, the combination

of Freeman and Bohannon would have helped in managing multiple versions of document by

using time-stamps.

It would have been therefore obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Freeman and Bohannon to provide users with a system to

manage documents based on timestamp associated with these documents, besides other things,

since this would have helped greatly in the documents archival (Freeman, col.1 line 60 to col.2

line 5).

Applicants argue that Kisor does not suggest a request for an electronic document

including a variable time-stamp.

This is not persuasive. Kisor's reference is used to further illustrate a URL that has an

associated request header for indicating a timestamp, Kisor's teaching discloses that the request

field in a GET specifies to the server to retrieve whatever information is identified the request

header field (Kisor, col.7 line 21-25). Kisor further discloses that a timestamp specifier is often

used in a typical HTTP header to specify the last modified date (Kisor, col.3 line50-59). All

these imply the use of a timestamp specifier in a user request header is available and readily to be

used.

It would have been therefore obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Kisor into Freeman and Bohannon to allow users to

retrieve desired Web information based on the time stamp, since Freeman would have provided a

time-stamp to determine the Web page's creation time.

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thu v Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9774. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone numbers for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular

communications (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications, and (703) 746-7240 for Non-

Official/Draft.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9000.

TVH
January 12, 2003

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100